AMENDMENTS to the DRAWINGS

No amendments or changes to the Drawings are proposed.

REMARKS

Note: All paragraph numbers referring to our disclosure correspond to the paragraph numbers as published in the pre-grant publication of our application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

"Computer memory device" and "Computer readable memory". With respect to the rejections of claims 1 - 15 for failing to disclose a "computer memory device", we respectfully point out our disclosure of a Central Processing Unit (CPU), #74 in Fig. 7, portion of a computer platform in ¶0031, along with an specific example of a computer platform being a personal computer in ¶0032.

We believe that one of ordinary skill in the art as evidenced and relied upon for the obviousness rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in the Office Actions dated 05/26/2005, 03/10/2006, and 10/19/2006, would recognize that a CPU and a personal computer contain computer-readable memory storage devices in order to properly function, as is further evidenced by the following extrinsic evidence:

> **CPU:** An abbreviation for central processing unit. The "brain" of a computer, the CPU is where data manipulation actually takes place. The results of these manipulations are then stored in the computer memory. Microprocessors perform this function in personal computers. *(Source: retrieved on 11/2/2009 from http://www.dictionary.com, attributed to The American Heritage® New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy, Third Edition Copyright © 2005 by Houghton Mifflin Company.)*

Read:

. . .

16. *Computers.* to obtain (data, programs, or control information) from an external storage medium or some other source and place in memory.

. . .

38. **read in,** *Computers.* to place (data, programs, or control information) in memory.

39. **read out**,

. . .

b. *Computers.* to retrieve (information) from a computer.

Store:

. . .

11. *Computers.* to put or retain (data) in a memory unit.

. . .

(Source: retrieved on 11/02/2009 from http://www.dictionary.com)

Please also note that we disclosed storing specific data in files (¶0076). We respectfully submit that storing data in a file necessarily requires memory storage devices such as RAM chips or disk drives, otherwise, such a file would not be physically, electronically, magnetically, or optically able to store and hold data.

Please also note that the term "computer readable memory" was included in our claims as originally filed, which are part of the disclosure as originally filed.

We respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections. If the Examiner maintains that such an ordinarily skilled person would not be conveyed that the Applicant was in possession of an invention which, in part, utilized a computer CPU and implicitly, therefore, computer readable storage memory devices, we respectfully request the Examiner to explicitly establish an ordinary skill level being relied upon for such a holding.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

With respect to the clarity of the term "breaking by a computer", the phrase "by a computer" was previously amended into the claims to reflect the invention's incorporation of a computer, such as a personal computer (please see remarks for rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph). The present invention is tied to this type of specific machine (a computer or computer platform including hardware and software as shown in Fig. 7).

The term "breaking" is supported by our disclosure in ¶0024 "[e]ach domain name is broken into a plurality of individual labels separated by the full stop character". For more details of how a domain name is broken into individual labels, one of ordinary skill might refer to ¶¶0064 - 0066, 0072, 0087, and Java embodiment lines 0023 *et seq.* shown in Table 4.

Similarly, we previously amended the claims to recite "reordering by a computer" in order to emphasis the tie of the invention to utilization and incorporation of a computer CPU. "Reordering" was disclosed in the Abstract, ¶¶0038, 0077, the claims as filed, and was shown in the example embodiment Java code in Fig. 4 (see line 185 *et seq.*, for example).

We respectfully submit that such full disclosure, including sample code embodiments, coupled with the common extrinsic meanings of these phrases would have been sufficiently clear to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the relative skill level presumed in the obviousness rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in the Office Actions dated 05/26/2005, 03/10/2006, and 10/19/2006.

We respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections. If the Examiner maintains that such an ordinarily skilled person would not find our disclosure in these areas of the claims sufficiently clear, we respectfully request the Examiner to explicitly establish an ordinary skill level being relied upon for such a holding.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

With respect to the Examiner's statement that ". . . the invention is realized as computer executable software . . . ", we respectfully disagree and submit that this phrase is not being considered in the context of our full disclosure. Please note that our ¶0035 states that "[t]he remainder of this disclosure is given with respect to the logical methods to be realized in computer executable software . . . ", clearly establishing that the previous portion of the disclosure was also part of the required elements of the invention. In prior paragraph ¶0031, the invention was described "as a function or method in computer-executable software for Internet servers, clients, and routing devices", which we believe would be understood by those ordinarily skilled in the art to necessarily include computing hardware, such as a CPU, as pointed out in the foregoing remarks, and as immediately following in ¶0031 through ¶0034.

In other words, we believe that one ordinarily skilled in the art would read these paragraphs and realize that software alone, without being executed by a processor, is unable to perform any steps in a method and unable to provide any functional elements of a system.

We are amending the rejected claims to specifically refer to a CPU, as disclosed. We respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections,

Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

We are submitting herewith cited art, Office Actions, Applicant Replies and Information Disclosure Statements from the following patent applications and patents naming the same inventor:

(a) SN 09/838,377, now U.S. patent 7,120,900, our docket AUS920010277US1, filed on 04/19/2001;

(b) SN 09/838,376, now U.S. patent 7,086,004, our docket AUS920010278US1, filed on 04/19/2001; and

(c) SN 09/931,302, now U.S. 6,883,007, our docket AUS920010428US1, filed on 08/16/2001.

We also bring to the Examiner's attention pending continuation application SN 11/463,131, our docket AUS920010277US2, which was filed on 08/08/2006, but which has not received a first Office Action yet.

Request for Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

We believe we have responded to all grounds of rejection and objection, but if the Examiner disagrees, we would appreciate the opportunity to supplement our reply.

We believe the present amendment places the claims in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, it is believed that the claims are not in a condition for allowance, we respectfully request constructive recommendations per MPEP 707.07(j) II which would place the claims in condition for allowance without need for further proceedings. We will respond promptly to any Examiner-initiated interviews or to consider any proposed examiner amendments.

Respectfully,

/ Robert Frantz /

Robert H. Frantz
U.S. Patent Agent, Reg. No. 42,553
Tel: (405) 812-5613
Franklin Gray Patents, LLC